

Serial No. : 10/772,498  
Filed : February 5, 2004

REMARKS


In the office action, the examiner rejected Claims 1, 12, 15, 16, 25, 27 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Sheha et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036848). The examiner indicated that Claims 2-11, 13, 14, 17-24, 26, 28 and 29 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, the applicant has amended Claims 1 and 16 to include the limitations of Claims 2 and 17 respectively. Claims 2 and 17 have been canceled.

In view of the foregoing, the applicant believes that Claims 1, 3-16, 18-30 are in condition for allowance, and accordingly, the applicant respectfully requests that the present application be allowed and passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

MURAMATSU & ASSOCIATES

Dated: 6/28/06

By:   
Yasuo Muramatsu  
Registration No. 38,684  
Attorney of Record  
114 Pacifica, Suite 310  
Irvine, CA 92618  
tel: (949) 753-1127